

Background

The problems encountered in urban field in Albania in general but particularly in Tirana required the necessary need for new approaches in Urban Development and upgrading. The ULMP is one of the most important initiatives of this nature, embodying in its philosophy the new concepts of Urban Management as implemented in other developing countries and at the same time stimulating the creativity for the specifics of Tirana development. This project which have been initiated about mid 90' from the USAID in collaboration with central and local authorities of Albania, is now in the most important phase of showing the concrete results.

The first attempt of the ULMP was Breglumasi pilot Site (Lapraka) of 31 hectares and Bathore Pilot Site of 13.4 Hectares. As a first example in Tirana and Albania of a typically participatory approach with important focus on Community participation and contribution, this project have already shown the first achievements besides the difficulties.

- The Breglumasi association is established and trained in a period of about 5 years and the same for the "Rilindja" association of Bathore which are becoming an active actor for the project.
- The public space is opened in major part of the area and some roads have been improved in Breglumasi and Bathore pilot site.
- A partnership agreement is signed between "Breglumasi" association with the Municipality of Tirana and "Rilindja" association with the Tirana District for the Infrastructure Improvement Project in the area.
- One third of the area is included in the project and have already contributed the first installment for electricity improvements in Breglumasi as their selected priority. The works for primary and secondary infrastructure have finished and the tertiary connections are on the process.
- While the pilot site in Bathore is about to start works for water and sewerage at the moment.
- The structure of the project is becoming clearer as regard tasks and responsibilities from the PCU as well as the PMT-s. The people involved in this structures are actually with far more experience and more motivated for the implementation process.
- The project has in a certain extend, drawn attention on the political level within Albania¹ and at the same time is considered as one of the most successful interventions of the World Bank worldwide experience.

In the above mentioned process of project preparation which particularly required the most of the time and energy already spend, it is important to mention the role of the Non Governmental Organizations as an important actor for project mobilization and nowadays also implementation.

¹ The Prime Minister of Albania and the president of World Bank visited Bathore pilot area in Summer 1999 with main focus on the ULMP project.

Co-Plan had the chance and capacity to be very close to the ULMP as one of the initial supporters and facilitators of this project in both pilot sites, which have put a lot of energies in it by:

- Working with communities to understand the project and perceive it as the unique real possibility for better life.
- Promoting and supporting the community associations on becoming a practical player for the project.
- Working with people to open the road spaces and improve roads together with them.
- Co-Plan have initially build up a bridge between people and authorities by organizing series of partnership discussions and trying to facilitate them and orient these discussions in problem solving rather than exchange of blames.
- Transfer the experience and contacts of community gradually to PMT-s and support them in specific situations as regard community discussions.

Actually based on the experience that Co-Plan have as regard community based Urban Development and the complete knowledge about the ULMP made possible the involvement in the Social Assessment for extending the project in four new sites like Mihal Grameno, Selita, Bathore 2 and Frutikultura.

For this Co-Plan is contracted out from the PCU to complete this work in the period April 2000 to end of August 2000.

The aim of the Social Assessment exercise was (i) to have the basic household social economic data in the four areas through a household survey, (ii) Prepare the physical survey for the four areas, (iii) prepare a pre-feasibility study, the concept plans for infrastructure works in each area, (iv) prepare together with the PMT-s the draft of partnership agreement of communities with the respective authorities in each area.

This objective of the study is followed by contemporary methodology and approach particularly as regard community participation, institutional involvement and integration and as well economic analyses in broad context of the city.

I. Social Assessment

The first phase of the project is related to the data collection from different sources in order to have the clearest possible situation for each of the sites. Basically this information collection process is drawn from (I) Household Survey, (ii) Focus Group Discussions and (iii) from In-depth interviews with different actors involved in the ULMP particularly those who make part of decision making process and assure the political support for the project.

The Household Survey aimed to collect the basic social, economical and physical information about the area with a focus on the existing infrastructure conditions, priorities of residents for improvements and their willingness to contribute for the project.

For this the questionnaire prepared with the assistance of the World Bank experts in the preparation phase of the project was translated into Albanian and as well modified in some aspects after the negotiations with the experts from the WB.

A team of students from the Faculty of Civil Engineering and of Social Sciences was formed to make the interviews with the residents in each area.

The team of 14 students was selected out of 21 candidates and then further trained for a week in the basic knowledge on the ULMP project as well as getting familiar with the questionnaire and the methods of proper communications with the residents.



As the number of interviews was limited from the contract in 350 for the four sites, with the assistance of local experts in statistical surveys a scientific sample was designed for selecting the households to be interviewed².

The interviews with the households in the four areas were complete in two weeks time and after that all the information is inserted in computers in a statistical program SPSS to be processed later. The data processing from the software which is made from the statistical specialist and later from Co-Plan staff assured a high standard of data outputs and as well as significant statistical correlation and logistic regressions.

² See for details the first Progress Report on Social Assessment on April 2000.

The household Survey resulted in a detailed report “Final Report on Social Assessment study performed in Selita, Mihal Grameno, Bathore 2 and Frutikultura neighborhoods of Tirana Albania”. This report has a summery information about the main findings from the four areas where also some comparable indicators have been introduced in order to be able to compare or see the differences between sites. Besides that a Report on detailed data for each area is included with all the necessary information based on the requirements of the Questionnaire and the TOR.

It is important to mention that the quality and quantity of data presented in the report express a high level of reliance³ as regard statistics and can be of very important to be used in the future as reliable indicators for the success of the project.

In order to give access to the report to everyone and to make possible to find easy and quick information for any of the four areas, a Matrix of the Household Survey is prepared with emphases on the most quantifiable indicators for each area. This matrix was found very helpful during the later phases of the projects and discussions with different actors.

The fact is that with the developments of the work some of the figures on this matrix have change so in the attachment 1 of this report will be a revised copy with the final figures.

Focus Group Discussion is meant as another form of information collection in the four selected sites and a complementary information to the statistical outputs in order to clear up the situation in the sites.

The initial aim of the FGD was to prepare a set of questions for a group of residents in order to receive direct information or feelings in particular issues that couldn't be quantify from the Household survey. These issues were mainly of social background and than with focus on needs and priorities in each area.



³ Besides the normal tables of output results there have been made some statistical correlation among different variables that influence each other's results. In this case only the ones with a high coefficient of significantly are included in the report.

Actually the initial aim of the FGD did not meet the interests of residents to discuss for practical things instead of giving some information. So even with our strong moderation the discussions were always led to the project alternatives and the practical requirements for it⁴. In this situation it is clear that the objective of the FGD as it is also explain in the earlier reports of this assignment, has deviated a bit from the original one of a pure information collection discussion.

In total there are organized 12 FGD (3 per each site) with a participation of around 25 to 30 residents per group. In general it was a poor participation of women in the meetings as a result of the general mentality of not involving them in decisions so we had to organize in some of the sites a particular meeting with women like in Bathore in order to get their opinion for the project.

The main outcomes from the FGD are:

- It was established the first contact of the work team with the residents as a good opportunity for identifying key persons for the later stages of the project.
- In this discussions the residents got a direct overview of the ULMP project and what it could offer to the area as well as what was required from resident to develop it.
- Basic information is collected on social, economic and physical characteristics of the areas and what were their common needs and priorities.
- A first impression was created from the team on the feasibility for project implementation in the selected areas and some basic information about social economic conditions of the area.

For details in FGD refer to the reports of each FGD in each of the areas in “Final Report on a Social Assessment study performed in The Selita, Mihal Geameno, Bathore 2 and Frutikultura neighborhoods of Tirana, Albania.

In depth Interviews with key actors of the ULMP project particularly with invidious that make part of decision making process and influence the political support, was an important activity for clearing out some decisive issues for the continuation of the project in future. In this respect the interviews were conceptualized as an informal discussion with this important actors of the project in order to get in return some realistic thoughts about the strong and weak points of the project.

The details on the main findings from the issues discussed on the in-depth interviews are listed on the Report on Social Assessment Study submitted by Co-Plan on July 2000. The findings from these discussions will make an important part of the Conclusions and recommendation chapter of this report.

In the attachment 2 is provided o copy of the report on findings from the in-depth interviews that gives more details.

⁴ The fact is that people in general lose their interest as long as the discussion is not concrete in terms of what they can gain from something and what is expected from them.

II. Physical Survey

The physical survey was part of the information collection process for the four areas and was very important for the success of later phases for the study. This work is subcontracted to a well-known company in Albania (GCC) as regard GIS application system.

As related to the selected areas the objective of the physical survey was (I) to prepare a complete up to date mapping of the sites including constructions, topography and anything else visible, (ii) drawings of the existing infrastructure in primary connections, secondary and as well where possible tertiary connections, (iii) plot bounders, walls, roads and paths.

The physical survey faced some difficulties that were mainly related to the kind of work required from the project which has been considered as unusual for the subcontractor as they had never done that before with such specific requirements.

So it took several discussions of PCU, PMT-s and Co-Plan with the company in order to assure that what was asked is well understood and implemented.

The other difficulties were the information about the existing underground infrastructure, which is very difficult to follow in an irregular area. For this Co-Plan mobilized people from the utilities to assist on this kind of information and at the same time from the residents in the area by providing to GCC additional information in this respect in order to complete the maps.

The physical survey was completed in time by providing good documents for the concept plan while it continued with an extension of some hectares that were reconsidered to be included in the sites.

Now the work is finished after receiving the approval of the PMT-s and PCU for the quality of the work and PCU will have with this report the soft and hard copies according to the contract.

The following pages will have the maps for each of the four areas Selita, Mihal Grameno, Bathore 2 and Frutikultura digitized by GCC.

Map of Selita

Final report of Social Assessment, Physical Survey, Pre feasibility study, preparation of concept Plan and draft community participation agreement. 7

III. Bathore 2 Map

III. Pre feasibility study Preparation of Concept Plans and Draft of Community Participation Agreements

This phase aimed firstly a general analyses of eligibility of areas under study for inclusion in the ULMP and secondly defining the existing situation of infrastructure in each area as well as preparation of preliminary costs for intervention in infrastructure improvements and the level of community contribution for the secondary infrastructure.

1. Pre feasibility study

For this based on the information accumulated from data collection process it came out a more clear picture on the real and practical possibilities for including the areas under study in the ULMP as regard:

- Economic features of the sites and the affordability analyses.
- The ratio between investments on primary and secondary which is mainly related with the distance of the areas from the source of infrastructure.
- Community behavior and organizing capacity of community as well as abilities to get role and responsibilities on improving their living environment.
- The level of infrastructure deficiencies in the areas.
- The expressed willingness to contribute for the project.
- The level of clearness as regard land ownership status.

Some of the indicators mentioned above are well elaborated in the first report “Final Report on a Social Assessment study performed in the Selita, Mihal Grameno, Bathore 2 and Frutikultura neighborhood of Tirana, Albania”.

In general it can be said that from this report it came out that statistically and practically speaking it exist no relation between economic situation of households in the sites and the willingness to pay.

This finding combined also with other direct opinions from residents is rather closely related to the fact of necessity to have something, than the cost to be paid for it. From the other site the monthly or yearly indicators of incomes for household become so relative as long as employment trends change rapidly in a situation where residents have no security for income level in the future.

So the main conclusion that came out was that the residents participation in the project would simply depend firstly on the necessity of infrastructure improvements and the process of fully understanding of its philosophy and seriousness.

In this respect the deep scientific analyses of affordability would not change from that of the two previous Pilot sites of Breglumasi and Bathore.

2. Concept Plan

Based on what is stated above, initially as some of the indicators for the eligibility of areas to be included within ULMP were missing still, besides some small feelings the four areas had almost equal chances for inclusion in the project. So the concept plans were prepared for each area as regard infrastructure needs.

Co-Plan considering the experience from project preparation and implementation in other sites of the ULMP project tried to follow a new approach as regard concept plan. This new approach consist on the direct involvement of city and district utility Enterprises in the concept plan as one of the important actors as well beneficiaries of the process which had been difficult before.

These utility Enterprises firstly were informed about the project idea and the results carried out at the moment while also explaining the direct benefit of their enterprises from it.

Secondly specialists were required from each enterprise to contribute on the concept plan by providing their information as regard existing conditions in the sites under the study and further on designing the technical solutions for intervention in primary network and secondary, tertiary as well.

Six specialists where involved in this process from the following enterprises of city and District:

- ❑ Municipal Water Enterprise of Tirana.
- ❑ Municipal Sewerage Enterprise of Tirana.
- ❑ Electricity Enterprise for Tirana Filial.
- ❑ District Water Enterprise of Tirana.
- ❑ Electricity Enterprise for Tirana District.
- ❑ Road specialists etc.

Obviously in this first step in order to include the utility providers in the project, informal ways have been used to reach this collaboration. The first result of this work has to do with the fact that they are already part of mechanism and have shown capacity to get ownership over its results as long as they are continuously engaged with it.

The preparation of the concept plan is done through a close collaboration of Co-Plan specialists with the utility specialists of each field. At the same time the result of work has been regularly discuss with the PMT-s and PCU. For this Co-Plan organized two rounds of discussions with the participation of all specialists from different utility enterprise, the PMT and the PCU for two sites of Municipality ones and the other for the two sites of district.

The aim of these discussions was first an introduction of these actors working for the same objective without knowing each other (in the professional point of view) and secondly to agree in certain standards, technical solutions with major impacts in the city or district and at the same time to share some responsibilities related to the project.

In general these meetings brought up e new development within the ULMP which can be fruitful if it is maintained in the future.

The concept plan in itself include the following information⁵:

1. All the possible information about the existing infrastructure for each of the areas and for each element of infrastructure⁶ as regard primary, secondary and tertiary networks.



2. Preliminary Designs of optimal technical solutions in primary supply for each element of infrastructure based on the realistic existing resources followed by consistent arguments.
3. Preliminary Designs of secondary network for each of the sites.
4. Preliminary cost estimation for each element of infrastructure divided in primary, secondary and tertiary investments.
5. Preliminary estimation of residents contribution for 20% of secondary infrastructure.

There are prepared two reports of Concept Plan that belong respectively one for the Municipality of Tirana and one for the District sites of Tirana.

The concept plan is discussed several times between Co-Plan, Utilities, PMT and PCU in order to assure a common understanding since the beginning. It is important to mention that the final discussion with the specialist of the World Bank gave a lot of inputs to the concept plan on the broad context of the project as well in technical aspects.

Based on these discussions from different actors the concept plan for the four sites required a revision work in order to reflect all the comments and new ideas. In the attachment is presented the revised copy of concept plan for the four sites. The revised copy of concept plan will enrich the overall information by including the

⁵ The detailed information about the concept plan is on the “Final report on Pre Feasibility Study and Concept Plan for Selita and Mihal Grameno (Bathore 2 and Frutikultura for the district) Neighborhoods of Tirana, Albania”.

⁶ Elements of infrastructure includes water, sewerage and drainage, electricity and street lighting, roads and waste collection system

comments and ideas from all the discussions mentioned above. At the same time new graphic illustration will be provided when the previous ones have changed or needed to be updated.

At the moment the concept plan is considered as a very important basis for the detailed designs for the companies that will carry out that activity.

At the same time the concept plan made possible an approximate estimation of investments in order to be able to judge for the project feasibility.

The concept plan indirectly received the informal approval from the utility providers as stakeholders of the project.

Finally the results of the concept plan provided the basic physical and financial information for the negotiations with residents for their involvement in direct contribution.

IV. Discussions and Stakeholder Workshops (SW)

The outcomes of the concept plan did provide the basic points of discussions with the residents and all the necessary arguments for the PMT-s in the coming negotiations with the residents in order to reach an agreement for the project.

The fact is that from the first contacts with residents in each area Co-Plan had explained its role in this project as a specialized group of professionals for project assessment and as intermediate party between community and authorities to come to an agreement. It was also explained that Co-Plan was going to prepare a concept plan together with specialists from utility providers and present that in meetings with all the actors. This would create a clear situation of what is the project offering to residents and what was exactly required from them in order to start implementation.

All these points for negotiations and the tasks, responsibilities as well as obligations between parties were listed in the draft for Partnership Agreement. These drafts are prepared following the Agreements signed between “Breglumasi” Association and “Rilidja” association with authorities. The preparation of the draft for PA is made through a process of discussions between Co-Plan team and PMT-s. Actually the PMT of District prepared the draft for PA for Bathore 2 and PMT of Municipality for the Mihal Grameno site. The role of Co-Plan team in this activity has only been as consultant and the work is completely done from the PMT-s. This methodology was part of the strategy of delegating the work to PMT so that the transition period from Co-Plan to PMT would have been as normal as possible.

Community work

In order to have a participatory process of all the communities for discussions about the project Co-Plan found it necessary to create a community organization structure in each of the sites. This process was certainly very difficult not only for the fact of working in complete new sites in very limited time but also the coincidence with the election period which initially created a serious barrier of trust with residents and than it was a factor of loosing concentration to people and especially to the active ones.

--	--

So parallel with the concept plan preparations each of the four neighborhoods is subdivided with the assistance of the local supporters in small groups of about 20 households. A form is prepared (and distributed to a key person for each subdivision group who was trained to organize the elections for the representative of the group. These forms are collected back with the signature of every household within the group meaning that they agree to have that respective person as representative of their subdivision group. In most of these election meetings Co-Plan and partially the PMT-s were present. Actually the following table gives an overview of this process in terms of figures.

Deleted: see attachment ???)

Neighborhood	Selita	Mihal Grameno	Bathore2	Frutikultura
No of subdivision groups	20	14	12	
No of forms distributed	20	14	12	0
No of forms received back (signed)	0	11	12	0
No of meetings with team presence	2	4	12	1
Total No of households signed	0	326	281	
Total No of elected representatives	0	30	23	

As it is clear from the table, in Selita particularly and in Frutikultura the results on subdivision representation was not at the same success as in Bathore 2 and Mihal Grameno for some reasons:

Firstly this process could hardly be completed in all necessary steps considering the very limited time available⁷.

Secondly it is to be mentioned that the case of Selita is a very specific one as regard community behavior and collaboration.

Residents in this site are very much infected from political developments in the country and some people tried to politicize the objectives of the project. From the other site when the situation of communication with community was very good established and they start trusting the team and trying to involve more people, a new organization (Urban Integration directed by Mr. Artur Çani) was suddenly appeared in the site initially pretending to be with the ULMP project and than promising to people the same infrastructure as of ULMP but without any financial contribution.

This situation created a big confusion to residents and as some of the active people from the area that were already member of the new organization started to destroy the wall that was build by our project team bit by bit. In this situation the meetings in the area were disturbed from some invidious intentionally and it was no more possible to contact with residents for the project.

At the same time the Frutikultura site is large in size and there are no preparation work with community organizations. From the discussions of the concept plan Frutikultura area is considered as an immature site for the ULMP objectives for the following reasons:

⁷ We can remind that the same process of subdivision groups took more than six months to be completed in Breglumasi and a bit less in Bathore Pilot Site while in this case this is total available time for the whole study in four times larger size.

- The urbanization process in the site is very slow or even blocked as a considerable part of land owners still use to develop agriculture as an income activity which makes the are less feasible for the project.
- The community structure is not existing even that the communication with residents is very good and positive.
- Some primary infrastructure is unclear for the moment of how will be solved in large scale for Kamza or Tirana like water main sources and electricity supply.

In this respect Frutikultura is considered as an eligible site for inclusion in the ULMP but the process to that is estimated to take longer period as other sites like Bathore 2 and Mihal Grameno.

So taking in consideration the most eligible sites for joining the project (Bathore 2 and Mihal Grameno) the team had to concentrate in some of them in order to have a signed agreement before the mandate of the former authorities was terminated⁸.

Anyway the process of subdivision representatives in each of the four sites prepared the terrain for formal discussions of community with authorities for the project conditions and implementation.

It has to be emphasize that like it will be also explained in the conclusions of this report the local election campaign was e real bottleneck for this process that requires time and massive participation as it excluded a considerable part of active people to be engaged in this process.

Stakeholders Workshops

Based on the initial activity plan presented in the proposal of Co-Plan to PCU for carrying out this study, the stakeholder workshops (SW) had to be held before the concept plan was prepared. Actually Co-Plan proposed to organize these workshops after the concept plan was completed taking in consideration that it could be more effective and attract the full attention of residents when everything is clear and fixed in terms of action to be taken and financial complications of parties involved. At the same time in this case the participation of community was organized based on a structure democratically elected from the neighborhood in small subdivision groups. Following the above logic the objective of Stakeholders workshop (SW) was enlarged from a dissemination activity which aimed to share findings of the SA with all stakeholders and beneficiaries to a negotiation process between all stakeholders and beneficiaries with concrete arguments for involvement in the ULMP project.

There are organized four SW in total for all the sites (one SW per each site).

The main points of discussion in these SW as stated in the objective were as follows:

⁸ Signing the agreement before elections would save a lot of time to communities and PMT to proceed with the project procedures particularly in such areas where residents were eager for starting the project as soon as possible.

- Presenting to residents the main findings from the household survey as regard social economic and physical characteristics and see whether they fit with their perception of the reality. Discuss for the priorities they expressed in earlier discussions and the level of consensus for a common problem.
- Present the technical designs for roads, water, sewerage, electricity, street lighting and waste collection. These designs were followed by explanations as regard primary resources and options for supply as well as some technical specifications for the secondary and tertiary network.
- Introduce the residents with the draft of Partnership agreement that had to be signed in order to implement the project.
- Explain the possible scenario for the project implementation as well as some rough time schedule and activities list to be taken.
- Particularly explanations are given on the specific role that community is expected to have within the project as an active partner of the PMT-s or the Municipality/District as a whole.
- Finally some initial tasks were settled between the PMT-s and residents to be completed particularly as regard the first action of signing the partnership agreement.

The first SW took place in the office of Tirana District on September 11, 2000 with the participation of 23 Bathore representatives of subdivision groups together with the head of “Rilindja” Association, the head of District Council Miss. Hatixhe Kellezi, the PMT of District and Co-Plan. In the [attachments](#) there is a detailed report on the meeting.

Important is to mention that the participation from resident was very good and differently from previous experiences people believed in the project and saw it as an opportunity for progress of the area. The Bathore 2 case had also some advantages for the speed of the process and negotiations process compare to other sites as listed below:

- Bathore 2 is located just next to Bathore pilot site and in general residents were well informed about the project and all its conditions.
- At the moment in the Bathore Pilot Site the implementation of Water and sewerage system has already started so it is not a dream anymore.
- The “Rilindja” Association is established two years ago with a lot of experience with the project and with very active people in it. This CBO is now extending its limits with the Bathore 2 involvement in the project within a very well established structure.
- In this respect the process of negotiations was well known for the residents and authorities and it required little time to be finalized.

Finally in the meeting after every point of the agenda was discussed and agreed the PMT distributed the testing forms with the final costs for water and sewerage provision. Every group representative was responsible to go to every household within his group to fill the form for confirming the financial participation in the project. After this when the result from the forms are positive it is fixed a tentative date for signing officially the Agreement with the District Council.

The second SW is organized between the Mihal Grameno community and authorities on September 18, 2000. The workshop differently from the first took place in the site in a place provided by community. It is important to mention that the participation of actors in this SW was of a high level compare to any of the once before. From authorities there were present The Minister of Public Works Mr. Ilir Zela, the vice Mayor of Tirana Municipality Mr. Ramiz Balla, The Chief of Urban Planing Department in the Tirana Municipality Miss. Juli Shllaku, The PMT of Municipality, Co-Plan Team.

While from community there were present about 30 people where 19 of them were the elected subdivision group representatives of 10 groups out of 14 in total. The discussion in this SW was about the main points listed earlier according to its objective. The report for the detail information about what were the points discussed will be in the attachment. To this point is important to mention that community reaction about the project in Mihal Grameno was very positive and promising for a good collaboration. In general people like the initiative and show will to participate in it even financially.

The SW in Mihal Grameno is concluded with the emergent tasks for people and PMT to distribute the testing forms for real willingness for participation of all the households and based on those results to sign the partnership agreement for implementing the project.

The third SW is organized in Selita site. All the contact people were informed formally and informally for the SW aiming to explain the area what Co-Plan had promised to do some months ago particularly presenting the approximate costs for contribution that people showed interest in the beginning.

Actually nobody showed up in the meeting even that the hall for the meeting was well prepared from the school director.

The fact is that for one reason or another residents in Selita do not feel comfortable with the alternative of the project or something else. In this respect agreeing also with other actors of the project it seems that this site have very little chances for the implementation of the project as long as there is no good understanding of residents within the area and than no bridge between community and NGO-s and authorities.

The fourth SW is organized in Frutikultura site. Based on the explanations above as regard situation in frutikultura the overall objective of the SW was not appropriate for the area. So in this case the objective of SW in Frutikultura was:

- To introduce the residents with the findings from Social Assessment
- To show the concept plan for the area as regard infrastructure conditions and the designs for improvements but without showing the costs as related to that.
- To explain to residents that their site is a possible option for the ULMP project as long as they will be able to fulfill some conditions as regard urbanization and land subdivision as well as creating the community structures.
- Explaining as clear as possible the steps to be taken in order to implement the project in the area which were related mainly to community organization and opening of the public space for the planed roads which will make people more attractive to construct in the area and get a more urban character.

Based on these objectives in this meeting there were drawn some base lines of dealing with this site which have some disadvantages of immaturity but at the same time is a perfect case to start the process of upgrading in an earlier stage compare to more dense and consolidated previous sites.

Work delegation to PMT-s

One of the tasks that Co-Plan commeted to this study was that the work in all the sites had to be transferred to the respective PMT-s in order to assure the connection with the community and the continuation of work for implementation. In this respect in the later phases of the study the involvement of PMT-s increased up to the point of complete self-management of work in the end.

The involvement of PMT consist firstly on transferring the contacts with people that Co-Plan team could create during the study and secondly by involving them in all phases in discussions and comments for all findings and recommendations.

Actually this transition is over in all the four sites and Co-Plan will be needed only as regard small particularities that might occur in any of the areas. For this Co-Plan team for this study have prepare all possible materials and also will assist with all the knowledge in the future.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

The project assessment study was a very important exercise not only for Co-Plan but also for all other actors involved on it like PMT, utilities key decision makers etc. The importance of it stands on the new approaches and methods applied for quick process of assessing and planning actions as regard formulating upgrading projects in Tirana. In this experience not only Co-Plan experts but also other stakeholders can better judge on the what is important and effectively useful information needed before starting this projects and what are the tools to define the project feasibility for the intended areas.

In the case of this project Assessment it was found that the major part of the time available for it was determined for the data collection process while less time for community work and analyses for implementation.

Obviously at the moment the institutional structure of the ULMP project is strengthened and showing professional capacity to run the project. At the same time their work is increasing progressively and risks being unmanageable for them with the human and financial resources they have. As it is also discussed with them

It would be a less time consuming if a pre selection study is done before the project assessment in order to avoid such studies in sites that are not prepared in a way or another for the project.

From the experience of Co-Plan with the ULMP preparation, mobilization, implementation and pre assessment it came out that this project seems to belong to areas with complete lack of infrastructure more than to area with deficiencies in infrastructure supply. This can explain the fact that in general the sites with complete lack of infrastructure system show higher interest and willingness compare to the ones that have it but not in proper conditions.

Findings from experts interviews

Recommendations

Considering the discussion in the communities about the project it is the right moment to direct the project in a more demand responsive approach. This can be achieved first by presenting its results now in the public and make it more transparent for a wider beneficiary group with clear objectives and conditions.

The first step that this phase of the project could establish with involvement of Utility Enterprises in the project will influence positively the implementation phase as long as this involvement continues. In this respect from the informal involvement a new step can be taken for formalizing this contribution and at the same time delegating some ownership from the project.

